

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Stephen Root,)
)
Plaintiff,) Civil Action No. 1:23-cv-5746-BHH
v.)
)
Commissioner of the Social Security)
Administration,)
)
Defendant.)

)

ORDER

This matter is before the Court upon the Magistrate Judge's report and recommendation ("Report"), which was made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d), D.S.C., and wherein the Magistrate Judge recommends that the Court deny Plaintiff's application to proceed without prepayment of fees. (ECF No. 8.) Attached to the Magistrate Judge's Report was a notice advising Plaintiff of the right to file written objections to the Report within fourteen days of being served with a copy. To date, however, no objections have been filed.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination only of those portions of the Report to which specific objections are made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of specific objections, the Court reviews the matter only for clear error. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life*

& Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’”) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Here, because no objections to the Report have been filed, the Court has reviewed the record, the applicable law, and the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge for clear error. After review, the Court finds no clear error and agrees with the Magistrate Judge’s analysis. Accordingly, the Court adopts and incorporates the Magistrate Judge’s Report (ECF No. 8), and for the specific reasons set forth in the Report, the Court denies Plaintiff’s application to proceed without prepayment of fees and affidavit (ECF No. 3) and orders Plaintiff to pay the full filing fee within fourteen days of this order’s filing date.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/Bruce H. Hendricks
United States District Judge

November 29, 2023
Charleston, South Carolina